

**CITY OF REDMOND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD**

April 19, 2007

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. Tapes are available for public review in the Redmond Planning Department.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Sally Promer-Nichols and Mery Velastegui

STAFF PRESENT: Steve Fischer, Senior Planner; Gary Lee, Senior Planner; Kerry Kriner, Assistant Planner

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Development Guide.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by the Chairperson of the Design Review Board Sally Promer-Nichols at 7:00 PM. Design Review Board members Dennis Cope, Robert Hall, Lee Madrid, David Scott Meade, and David Wobker were excused.

MEETING CLOSE

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. VELASTEGUI AND SECONDED BY MS. PROMER-NICHOLS TO CLOSE THE MEETING AT 7:05 PM. MOTION CARRIED (2-0).

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE070013, Microsoft Building 92

Description: Existing Eddie Bauer headquarters to be renovated into a mix of corporate learning center and offices, including the addition of two stair towers, elevator, canopies and relocation of the loading dock.

Location: 150th Avenue NE and NE 36th Street

Applicant: Andy Paroline with Paroline + Associates

Staff Contact: Kerry Kriner / 425.556.2464

Kerry Kriner presented the staff report for this second pre-application meeting on some exterior changes to the previously Eddie Bauer headquarters building that was purchased by Microsoft and being renamed Building 92, or the Learning Center. Previously there were comments from the board about relooking at canopy design, changing the emergency stairs, and incorporating some of the existing building elements. The canopy at the west entrance has now been removed from the proposal.

Scott Hunter, NBBJ Architects, 223 Yale Avenue N, Seattle, WA 98109, reviewed the applicant's design modifications in response to the DRB comments in the previous review. He showed an updated design of the stair tower. He clarified that they have merged the two generators from B95 + B92 into one and submerged it so that it will only be about four feet out of the ground, down at the basement area in a well and open to the sky. They have done some refinements to the loading dock area.

Jin Ah Park, NBBJ Architects, 223 Yale Avenue N, Seattle, WA 98109, showed that they have interpreted the Board's previous comments about working more with the language of the building that is already there which has a heavy base and a big tent-like roof. The new canopy definitely feels like it is in the family of the existing canopy. It is a standing, seam metal roof. Underneath is a light, cream-colored soffit. They kept the planters but removed the trees because of the canopy. What they have done in the spirit of the trees is to have the columns that are a little more organic and tilting to remind one of the tree trunks. There will be ferns planted along there. The concept for this building is the forest theme. They are also proposing open slots on the canopy so it is open to air and provides more light. Regarding the comment about handicap access, they have made it more visible. They have proposed something more translucent with signage for the building. Looking at the overall elevation, the language of the big roof speaks to the new canopy. The other entrance canopy has the same language and is a big, strong

horizontal plate that is anchored to the building. The existing stairs are being retained, and the added secondary stairs have been integrated as part of the building instead of an added element.

COMMENTS BY THE DRB MEMBERS:

Ms. Velastegui:

- Wanted to know how they were going to support the canopy. Thought they would need some cable. Thought the canopy looked great but needed support. (The applicant responded that they did not have an exact plan, but they thought a column would be more appropriate than introducing cables. Overall the principle is to keep the horizontal line clean and not to have cables or brackets. They have been talking with their structural engineer. The canopy is anchored to the building along most of its length.)
- Said she liked the stairs, but thought the integrated stairs were still the weakest part of the design. (The applicant wanted to keep this stair subdued because it is not a primary entry point and they do not want to send a false message to make people want to go to that stair because it goes directly into the library. They don't want to have a security problem going into the library. They did not want this stair to feel like a grand statement of entry but to blend in with the building.)
- Thought it was more about the connection with the pedestrian link to the commons, not the building itself, where the applicant was solving the problem.
- Agreed finally that her comment about the library stair had to do more with the look of the elevation, and because this is a secondary stair, it should blend in with the building.
- Confirmed that the clinic was in the originally proposed location and liked that a clinic is included.

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Thought the applicant had responded to all of the DRB members' comments. (An email to her from Mr. Cope expressed his support as well.)
- Agreed with the applicant that people would hardly ever see this building and thought it made a nice statement at the end with the articulation going on there.
- Understood that the stair going up to the library is a secondary stair and should blend in.
- Was excited about the front entry.
- Liked the handicap access ramp and that it was not being hidden.
- Thought the design was great.
- Thought they were definitely on the right track and have DRB support on the direction they are going.

Staff had a comment on the loading dock area. On one of the site sketches, there appeared to be a fire lane along the low wall on the B95 side. If that is the case, staff recommended mimicking that on the B92 side.

There was agreement that the project was ready to return for approval.

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE070026, 166th Avenue Condominiums

Description: 51-unit condo building with four floors of residential over two parking garage levels

Location: 8500 166th Avenue NE

Applicant: Redmond Town Center LLC

Staff Contact: Gary Lee / 425.556.2418

Gary Lee presented the staff report, stating staff's responses to the originally submitted packet: staff's nonsupport of the proposed architectural style and wanting to hear Board comments regarding the design packet and the issues of the architectural style not being appropriate for the East Hill District, the lack of an entry focus to the building, and seeming isolation of the lower amenity room. He explained that the applicant provided a new packet of elevations at this meeting, much different than that previously submitted. The new packet had a different architectural style with the popouts more articulated at the top.

Brad Butterfield, 21911 76th Avenue, Suite 210, Edmonds, WA 98026, presented the updated packet. He explained that they had reacted to staff's reaction to the proposed design and had dramatically changed the elevations to meet the character of the neighborhood. They have now gone to a brick and wood building. They showed a contextual drawing of the project in the neighborhood. This would be a fairly

large building with two structured floors of parking in the basement, then three floors of condominiums, and a fourth floor of penthouse condos above. To break up the mass of the building, they have held the fourth floor elevation back, and there are now decks on the fourth floor, which helps to soften the height of the building. To break up the mass, they have done a lot of modulation, dramatically changed the rooflines, put a series of bay windows with cedar siding and a lot of brick on the front of the building, and chose not to do the cedar base because the design was getting really vertical and lineal. There would be a strong entry with a canopy. They consider this to be quite a bit softer than the steel building they had previously. They are now proposing no metal on the building although he would like to include some. On the fourth floor, they were thinking about using a lap siding on that. They want the west building elevation to look very much like the end of the building and not compete with the front of the building. They have added towers with large parapets and braces to try to give the building a contemporary yet warm wood feel. The north elevation, the back of the building, is quite steeply sloped. He liked the rhythm and the way that elevation felt. The east elevation is also heavily sloped in two directions. The large windows on both ends are dining rooms and are designed to let light in from the floor almost to the ceiling. They did not see how an entrance off 166th Avenue NE would be appropriate because of the heavy, fast traffic on that hill. The entrance would have to be at the second level of the parking garage. The City's Engineering staff had really discouraged them from an entrance on 166th Avenue NE. For amenities, they have added a large amenity room on the top floor, and there is another one off the lobby on the first floor. He confirmed that their client was pleased with the changes and agreed they are more appropriate for Redmond.

COMMENTS BY THE DRB MEMBERS:

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Had liked the other building but did not like it where it was because she knew the neighborhood would have a fit, so thanked him for taking the comments and returning with the changes.
- Was pleased to see the changed direction.
- Said she could see the Hardipanel being metal instead. She liked metal. Thought there would be nothing wrong with using metal and that the original proposal had too much metal siding. Would like to see the horizontal siding expressed with something different. Would be totally supportive of trying different materials. Overall, the scale and details are very warm and residentialish.
- Loved the front entry. Liked the marquis.
- Liked the north elevation.
- Supported not having a door on the west elevation, but thought it currently looked like the end of a building. Might be reacting to the small kitchen windows that looked like bathroom windows and should be bigger and more prominent. Was not quite as concerned about this on the east elevation.
- Thought initially that the southwest corner was looming and heavy at the top. Knew that they have symmetry on the street and wanted to keep that symmetry, but thought they should study this more.
- Liked the dining room windows being large.
- Thought the proposal was great conceptually and liked the direction they were going.
- Thought there was an opportunity to do an outdoor space—a deck or patio—outside the main amenity room on the first floor. This would require some retaining walls. This would also help fire entry.

Ms. Velastegui:

- Thought there was nothing that was disability friendly. (Mr. Butterfield explained that the building was totally accessible to meet ADA code. He said there were literally no steps into this building. The building could be entered from either the public access sidewalk or from the parking places without a single step. They will consider the adequacy of one elevator for wheelchair access.)
- Thought the long corridor did not provide a sense of community. (Mr. Butterfield responded that is why the elevator is located in the center of the building.)
- Suggested that they create some kind of lobby or community area.
- Commented that 166th Avenue NE should be more pedestrian friendly, maybe through landscape by creating a seating area.
- Thought the scale of the corner tower should be minimized in comparison to the 30' retaining wall for human scale from the streetscape—perhaps using a canopy. (Mr. Butterfield noted that they had not spent much time on the site plan yet and would refine it.)
- Liked the materials.

- Was not sure if she liked the cornice, although she liked the band.
- Liked the front entry.
- Thought moving the penthouse floor back was a smart idea.
- Thought having the brick material softens and warms the building.
- Liked a little metal, but there was originally too much.

Sam Evich, 21911 76th Avenue W, #101, Bellevue, WA 98004, pointed out that they had included a new landscape plan in the revised packet that starts to address the edges of the building and the sidewalk.

The applicant would return for another pre-application review at the next meeting.

PRE-APPLICATION

PRE070028, Westgate Building

Description: Exterior and landscape upgrade to 78 existing apartment units to be converted to condominiums

Location: 15600 Redmond Way

Applicant: Steve Elkins with Steven P. Elkins Architects

Staff Contact: Steven Fischer / 425.556.2432

Steve Fischer, Senior Planner, presented the staff report. This is an update to an older office building. The proposed exterior modifications are to replace the concrete tile roof with a standing seam metal roof, replace the fascia with Hardiplank boards, replace the existing wood doors with anodized aluminum store front doors, paint window trims to match door colors, and paint new fascia and walls on the existing three-story building to match the three pairs on the one-story building. Staff feels this is an appropriate upgrade for the existing office building. The pediment appears to be an appropriate scale to the building and is tied back into the mansard roof, which makes it feel a part of the original building as opposed to something applied later. The colors for the new metal roof have not been presented to staff. Staff had concern that the blue color might appear dark.

Steve Elkins, 17000 NE 33rd Place #101, Bellevue, WA 98004, explained that the current TMG-type panels are warped, tired and rotting. There is a clay tile roof that has been patched over the years in different colors. He showed pictures of the existing building. There is now retail in the front lower section of the building, and the visibility coming down Redmond Way, especially with the street trees and the building setback, is not good. There is nothing eye-catching there. They elected to put the new canopy areas in front of the existing brick panels instead of in front of the storefronts for that reason. The existing brick has some character to it so they proposed to leave it as is. He showed color samples and the locations of the columns.

COMMENTS BY THE DRB MEMBERS:

Ms. Velastegui:

- Thought this was a handsome group of colors, but she was concerned about the blue color. Although a nice color, the blue would not pop out from the street. She would change to a warmer color for more success in catching the eye from the street. (The applicant agreed to return with a couple of color choices. He suggested a canary yellow.)
- Suggested adding some color to enhance the brick wall without painting the brick.
- Requested that they bring samples of the materials for the next review.

Ms. Promer-Nichols:

- Requested that they show the entire elevation for the application.
- Requested they highlight how this ties in with the existing other building.

Mr. Fischer summarized that he had heard from the Board that this is going in the right direction and that this project should come in next with an application for approval. The applicant should bring 4" x 4" color samples with first choices and one alternative for each.

ADJOURNMENT

IT WAS MOVED BY MS. VELASTEGUI AND SECONDED BY MS. PROMER-NICHOLS TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 8:30 PM. MOTION CARRIED (2-0).

MINUTES APPROVED ON

RECORDING SECRETARY